

REMARKS

The claims have been amended by rewriting claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 11 and 13, canceling claims 10 and 12. Claims 1-9, 11, and 13-15 remain in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Claims:

Claims 7 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- *Claim 7, lines 10 and 11, “prior to the detect pin” is missing text; also, the text is missing between “disconnecting” and “after the detect pin”.*
- *Claim 10 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 7.*

Claim 7 has been amended to insert language to clarify “connecting to” and “disconnecting from” the communication device connector. Claim 7, as amended, is believed to overcome the objection.

Claim 10 has been canceled, and the related dependent claims have either been canceled or amended to depend on claim 7. The objection is thus overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsushita (U.S. 4,849,944).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: the supply and ground contacts being longer than the at least one other contact “so as to be first to contact to and last to disconnect from a mating connector, thereby preventing sparking during detachment of the connector from the mating connector”. Matsushita does not teach or suggest preventing sparking during detachment of the card. Matsushita protects against static discharge, not sparking. Furthermore, Matsushita

protects against static discharge only when the card is inserted – not detached. Matsushita extended the ground contacts so that mechanically, they are the first to connect on insertion. On insertion, when either ground contact is made, the static charges flow (discharge) from one to the other basically neutralizing the static potential. The primary objective of Matsushita is to prevent initial static discharge from going through.

Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is believed to overcome the rejection.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite “... a supply contact and a ground contact having a first predetermined length....”. Support for this amendment is found page 3, lines 9-15 of the specification. This amendment clarifies that the supply and ground contacts are the same length. The Examiner referred to contacts (13) of Matsushita as being the equivalent of supply contacts. However, contacts (13) are not ground contacts. The ground contacts of Matsushita are (10, 12) and these are not the same length as contacts (13). The clarification that the supply contact and the ground contact have a first predetermined length is believed to overcome the rejection.

Claim 3 has been amended to recite that the indication of detachment from the another contact causes power to turn off at the power contacts thereby preventing sparking. Support for this amend is found on page 4, lines 10-12. As discussed above, Matsushita is focused on discharging static during insertion, whereas Applicant is focused on preventing sparking during detachment. Claim 3, as amended, is believed to overcome the rejection.

Claim 6 is a dependent claim providing further limitation to that is believed to be an allowable claim 3 and hence is also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-3 and 6 under U.S.C. § 102(b) is believed to be overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushita (US4849944) in view Faull (US6,677,772 B1).

Claim 4 is a dependent claim providing further limitation to what is believed to be an allowable claim 3, as amended. Thus, claim 4 is also in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushita (US4849944) in view Sadler (US6,058,319).

Claim 5 is a dependent claim providing further limitation to what is believed to be an allowable claim 3, as amended. Thus, claim 5 is also in condition for allowance.

Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishizawa et al. (US 6,669,487 B1) in view of Matsushita (US 4,849,944).

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the disconnection of the detect pin causes power to turn off at the supply pin prior to disconnection of the supply pin thereby preventing sparking. Claim 7, as amended, is believed to be in condition for allowance. None of the cited references taken individually or in combination teach or suggest that which is claimed by Applicant's invention. As discussed above Matsushita is directed towards protection against static upon insertion. Matsushita fails to teach or suggest the prevention of sparking during disconnection. As such, the rejection of claim 7 is believed to be overcome.

Claims 8, 9 and 11 (as amended) are dependent claims providing further limitations to what is believed to be an allowable claim 7 and as such, are also in condition for allowance. Claims 10 and 12 were canceled as discussed previously under "objections".

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishizawa et al. (US 6,669,487 B1) in view of Matsushita (US 4,849,944) and Faull (US 6,677,772 B1).

Claim 13 has been amended to recite that detachment of the at least one other contact causes power to turn off at the plurality of power contacts prior to detachment of the plurality of power contacts from the communication device thereby preventing sparking. None of the cited references taken individually or in combination teach or suggest that which is claimed by Applicant's invention. As discussed above Matsushita is directed towards protection against static upon insertion. Matsushita fails to teach or suggest the prevention of sparking during disconnection. As such, the rejection of claim 13, as amended, is believed to be overcome.

Claims 14 and 15 are dependent claims providing further limitations to what is believed to be an allowable claim 13 and thus, are also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 502117,
Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department
Intellectual Property Section, Rm 1610
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24,273

By:


Barbara R. Doutre
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 39,505

Telephone: 954-723-6449
Fax No.: 954-723-5599